



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 12, 2013

Ms. Rachel L. Lindsay
Counsel for the City of McKinney
Brown & Hofmeister
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2013-09851

Dear Ms. Lindsay:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 490850.

The City of McKinney (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all records of calls made by the requestor concerning two named persons during a specified time frame. You inform us you have released the majority of the requested information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note Exhibit B is not responsive to the instant request because it is not a record of a call made by the requestor. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the city is not required to release non-responsive information in response to this request.¹

Next, we note the responsive information was the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2013-05852 (2013). However, while the requestor in Open Records Letter

¹As we are able to make this determination, we do not address your argument against disclosure of this information.

No. 2013-05852 had a right of access to the information that is now at issue, this request involves a different requestor who does not have the same right of access to the information at issue. Thus, the circumstances have changed, and the city may not continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2013-05852 as a previous determination in this instance. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). Accordingly, we will address your argument against disclosure of the information at issue.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides in relevant part:

[T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act], and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

- (1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and
- (2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

...

(k) Notwithstanding Subsection (a), an investigating agency, other than the [Texas Department of Family and Protective Services] or the Texas Youth Commission, on request, shall provide to the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child who is the subject of reported abuse or neglect, or to the child if the child is at least 18 years of age, information concerning the reported abuse or neglect that would otherwise be confidential under this section. The investigating agency shall withhold information under this subsection if the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of the child requesting the information is alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect.

(l) Before a child or a parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under Subsection (k), the custodian of the record or file must redact:

...

(2) any information that is excepted from required disclosure under [the Act], or other law[.]

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (k), (l)(2). Upon review, we find the submitted information was used or developed in an investigation by the city's police department of alleged or suspected child abuse. *See id.* § 261.001(1)(A) (defining "abuse" for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code); *see also id.* § 101.003(a) (defining "child" for purposes of chapter 261). In this instance, however, the requestor is the parent of the child victim named in the report. Further, the parent is not the individual alleged to have committed the alleged abuse. *See id.* § 261.201(k). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information from the requestor under section 261.201(a). *Id.* However, section 261.201(l)(2) states that any information that is excepted from required disclosure under the Act or other law may still be withheld from disclosure. *Id.* § 261.201(l)(2). Thus, we will consider your arguments under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 58.007 of the Family Code. Juvenile law enforcement records relating to delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision that occurred on or after September 1, 1997, are confidential under section 58.007(c) of the Family Code. *Id.* § 51.03(a), (b) (defining "delinquent conduct" and "conduct indicating a need for supervision"). Section 58.007 provides in relevant part:

(c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise, concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are separate and distinct from controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subchapters B, D, and E.

Id. § 58.007(c). For purposes of section 58.007(c), a “child” is a person ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age at the time of the reported conduct. *See id.* § 51.02(2). Upon review, we agree Exhibit C involves a child engaged in delinquent conduct that occurred after September 1, 1997. It does not appear any of the exceptions to confidentiality under section 58.007 apply in this instance. Therefore, we find Exhibit C is confidential under section 58.007(c) of the Family Code and must be withheld in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code.²

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Kathryn R. Mattingly
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KRM/bhf

Ref: ID# 490850

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.